

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-30 are pending in the application, with 1, 15, 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 15 and 21 are sought to be amended and claims 29-30 are sought to be added. Claims 4, 5, 18, 19, and 24 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 9-10, 13-16, 18-24, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,208,973 to Boyer *et al.* (hereinafter "Boyer"). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 3-6, 11-12, 17, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,704,044 to Tarter *et al.* (hereinafter "Tarter"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Prior to Applicant's invention, third party payors did not possess information regarding the specific products for which they were providing coverage. Providers were required to bill third party payors using HCPCS codes, which are general codes that do not specify individual products used to treat a beneficiary. Thus, the third party payors only possessed general information regarding the products for which they were providing

coverage. This hinders the ability of the third party payor to negotiate with product manufacturers. The codes cited in Boyer do not relate back to specific products. For example, Boyer illustrates in Figure 6 a health care charge of "Collect Venous Blood" of \$30, but it does not unbundle the actual syringe, the brand of syringe, the vacutainer used to collect the blood, or the vacutainer's brand.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15 and 21 to recite that the health care order includes HCPCS product codes and that these codes are mapped to at least one more specific product code, including SKU, UPC, and NDC codes (as defined on page 16 of applicant's application). The more specific product code is then provided to the third party payor. Thus, the claimed invention as amended provides specific product information to the third party payor so that they can, for example, negotiate with manufacturers for lower prices on specific products. Thus, this creates competition for better products and lower prices for the benefit of the consumer.

In short, Boyer and/or Tarter fail to teach mapping HCPCS product codes to at least one more specific product code and providing this more specific product code to a third party payor. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-17, 20-23 and 25-28 be withdrawn and that these claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 36,013

Date: October 6, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

385903_1.DOC